

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 4-11, 19 and 23 were previously pending in the application. Applicants have amended claims 4, 19, and 23 herein. No new matter has been entered by way of this amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4-11, 19 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by US Patent 6,633,795 to Suzuki, et al. ("Suzuki). Claims 4, 19, and 23 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 4, 19 and 23 as amended, as well as the claims directly or indirectly dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Amended independent claim 4 recites, *inter alia*:

An environmental information system comprising:
a product constitution information storage means...;
a raw material environmental information storage means
for storing environmental information about an amount of *each of the hazardous substance* included in each of the raw materials;
an obtaining means...; and
an integrated environmental information forming means for forming integrated environmental information including a total amount of *each of the hazardous substance* included in the obtained raw materials which constitute the designated product.. (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that Suzuki does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements recited in amended independent claim 4.

Suzuki discloses a system to recycle manufactured product. To this end, Suzuki compares information exacted from an article specification information database 35 (Col. 9, lns. 10-11 and Col. 9, ln. 55-col.10 ln 4, Fig. 7) with information exacted from statutory regulation information database 36 (Col. 9, lns. 15-18) to check whether hazardous materials are included in the part/product, then utilizes appropriate recycling method to recycle the product parts (Col. 22, lns. 36-39 and Col. 9, lns. 47-57) Suzuki lists contents of the specification information database 35 “part number, part name, manufacturer, model name...weight, information concerning harmful parts.” (Col. 13, lns. 46-54) The “material name” column in Fig. 7 shows all the raw materials of a part including the hazardous and non- hazardous materials, the weight column lists the entire weight of the part. For example, to determine whether the substrate assembly (PWB ASS'Y) of a discarded television contains hazardous material lead (Pb), information is retrieved from the article specifications information database 35. As illustrated in FIG. 7, the substrate assembly (PWB ASS'Y) is designated by the part number "3" and the “material name” column contains “Pb+Cu+ etc.” Since the “material name” column lists “Pb”, the substrate assembly falls within the category of the component part containing lead (Pb) (Col. 22, ln 57-col 23. ln 3 and Fig. 7) However, Suzuki only discloses names of the hazardous materials in the component parts, “an amount of *each of the hazardous substance* included in each of the raw materials” as claimed in independent claim 4 is not disclosed. Fig. 7 also shows a “weight” column, however, it is the weight of the entire product, the “total amount of *each of the hazardous substance* included in the obtained raw materials which constitute the designated

product” as claimed in independent claim 4 is not formed.

Therefore, Applicants submit the “amount of each of the hazardous substance” included in the raw materials and the “total amount of each of the hazardous substance” included in the raw material in the designated product, recited in independent claim 4 is patentably distinct from information stored in and formed from Suzuki’s article specification information database. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 4 is patentably distinct from the cited references for at least this reason. Independent claims 19 and 23 are patentably distinct from the cited reference for similar reasons. Further, Applicants submit that claims 5-11, which are directly or indirectly dependent on amended independent claim 4 are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least this reason. Therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of rejections.

Application Serial No. 09/902,194
Amendment dated February 1, 2006
Docket No. 1232-4736

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented herein are allowable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, should that in anyway facilitate prosecution.

Applicants believe no fee nor extension of time is required for this filing. However, should an extension of time be necessary to render this filing timely, such extension is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4736

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN LLP

Dated: February 1, 2006

By: Ping Gu
Ping Gu
Registration No. L0040

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281
(212) 415-8700